



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The fearfully destructive quality of modern war is more and more strongly impressing the minds of our legislators, and, furthermore, they are coming to agree with Congressman Mondell, that the nations are learning the lesson long ago learned by private individuals, that it does not pay to fight out quarrels—that therefore it is the duty of free self-government to join with other nations in a reduction of expenditures for the purpose of war. In the language of Congressman Brumbaugh:

"This rivalry in battleship building must stop some time—why not now?"

Said Congressman Bailey:

"I believe in a naval holiday, not for one year, but for all time."

Congressman Sisson said:

"If history teaches me anything, it teaches me that no government was ever preserved by enormous armies and by enormous taxes. It teaches that when you take away from a private citizen the substance which he has earned and convert it into salaries, and expend it through the public treasury, the burdens of expense get to be so great that the people themselves destroy their own government. * * * We must live with our neighbor nations, and, if we mean peace, we must take the first step which leads us toward peace. We cannot cry 'Peace!' 'Peace!' and at the same time be preparing and standing for war, war, war."

Congressman Hamlin expressed himself thus:

"Shall we decline to pass resolutions so just and so proper simply because, forsooth, some nation may decline to accept it—that our proposition may be rejected and we humiliated? We cannot be humiliated in trying to do right. We may not get it accepted in 1914. If not, let us try in the good year 1915; and if we fail then, try again in the good year 1916. We ought not to be weary in well-doing. I believe as firmly as I believe I am standing here that there is coming a time when we shall have universal peace."

Congressman Gray used these words:

"Few men today will realize the full meaning or true significance of this movement. Few men today will comprehend the effect upon human society or the change to be wrought in the affairs of nations. I believe that this movement will mark a new era in the history of civilized men. I believe that the human race will here turn from strife and mortal combat, from gore and carnage, from the bloody shambles of the past, from wanton destruction, from the slaughter of the innocent and the awful waste of human life—turn to mutuality of human effort, to a glorious future of peace and goodwill."

From such declarations it is evident that the significance of the Hensley resolution lies partly in the opportunity it afforded the United States Congress to crystallize its thought upon the great question of all international questions—the reduction of the world's

overburdening and unnecessary armaments. But the significant fact is that the United States Congress is practically a unit in favor of such reduction.

Editorial Notes.

The President's International Standard.

The annual message of the President to Congress was read in person on December 2, 1913. The following extract is of profound encouragement to all workers for international arbitration and peace:

"The country, I am thankful to say, is at peace with all the world, and many happy manifestations multiply about us of a growing cordiality and sense of community of interest among the nations, foreshadowing an age of settled peace and good will. More and more readily each decade do the nations manifest their willingness to bind themselves by solemn treaty to the processes of peace, the processes of frankness and fair concession. So far the United States has stood at the front of such negotiations. She will, I earnestly hope and confidently believe, give fresh proof of her sincere adherence to the cause of international friendship by ratifying the several treaties of arbitration awaiting renewal by the Senate. In addition to these, it has been the privilege of the Department of State to gain the assent, in principle, of no less than thirty-one nations, representing four-fifths of the population of the world, to the negotiation of treaties by which it shall be agreed that whenever differences of interest or of policy arise which cannot be resolved by the ordinary processes of diplomacy they shall be publicly analyzed, discussed, and reported upon by a tribunal chosen by the parties before either nation determines its course of action.

"There is only one possible standard by which to determine controversies between the United States and other nations, and that is compounded of these two elements: Our own honor and our obligations to the peace of the world. A test so compounded ought easily to be made to govern both the establishment of new treaty obligations and the interpretation of those already assumed."

Dr. Charles Richet Honored.

The Nobel Prize for 1913 for medical science has been awarded to Dr. Charles Richet, professor of physiology in the University of Paris and member of the Academy of Medicine. This is an honor most worthily bestowed, and, although given for medical research, is of especial interest to peace workers everywhere, because of Dr. Richet's intimate association with the cause of international arbitration and peace.

Dr. Richet has for many years been the president of the *Société Française d'Arbitrage entre les Nations*. He is a member of the council of direction of the review, *La Paix par le Droit*, and has been since 1907 a member of the commission of the Berne Peace Bureau. "We are justly proud," says *Le Mouvement Pacifiste*,

"of this honor, because Mr. Richet is one of us, and this distinction conferred upon him reflects glory also upon all who, with him, are striving for the triumph of right, justice, and peace. The conferring of the prize upon Dr. Richet proves that there are not alone utopian dreamers in the ranks of the pacifists, but also scholars who have already realized in the field of science some of the progress which they are bringing about in other realms."

British Protests Against Conscription. In the last issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* there was pointed out the danger threatening England of the introduction of compulsory military service as an outcome of its establishment in Australia and New Zealand. That the movement grows steadily in strength and boldness is seen from the number of meetings held for its promotion and the strong protests made against it by the friends of peace.

The National Service League held a meeting in Birmingham only last month to promote the views of those who wish to introduce the system into Great Britain, Lord Curzon being one of the chief speakers. A novel form of protest was undertaken by some of the students of the university and other young men of the city. For many hours on the day the meeting was held they paraded the streets decorated as "sandwich men," carrying boards bearing such mottoes as these:

"Far from making men of weaklings, forced military training rejects them as unfit."

"Has conscription saved Bulgaria?"

"Did conscription save France in 1870?"

On November 28 there was held at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, London, a large and impressive demonstration against compulsory service. The meeting had been arranged by the Peace Society, and stirring addresses were made by such influential speakers as Dr. Horton, Herbert Corder, W. C. Anderson, C. P. Trevelyan, and Lady Barlow. Joseph Albert Pease, M. P., presided, and in the course of his remarks said that, inasmuch as the National Service League was making such strenuous efforts for conscription, it behooved those who believed in civil liberty, individual freedom, and the principles of democracy to point out the dangers to the safety and well-being of the country if the youth of the country was to be subjected to compulsory service. The case for conscription had not been made good. Although he did not believe that any government could yet discard force, Mr. Pease declared that it was a disgrace to civilization that military and naval expenditure in Great Britain had increased from \$160,000,000 to \$380,000,000: the democracies should everywhere demand an enormous reduction of wasteful expenditure and better methods of settling international disputes.

Lord Roberts' perversion of the teachings of Christ was amazing—"the symbol of peace is no longer an angel, but a sword." Mr. Pease said, moreover, that compulsion would further increase estimates; that conscription fostered the idea that war was necessary, and a nation trained to arms was more quickly aroused to a demand for war. Liberty, efficiency, economic interests, and moral home influence were at stake. To democracy we must look to remove the frightful curse of armament and rivalry.

The following resolution was unanimously voted:

"This meeting, believing that compulsory military service is calculated to extend the power of militarism and constitutes a menace to liberty, calls upon every lover of freedom to resist any proposal of compulsory military training or service, and regards conscription in any form as opposed to the interests of the United Kingdom."

The Year 1915. Men and women appointed for the purpose of promoting the celebration of one hundred years of peace between England and our country met in Richmond, Virginia, December 3 and 4. Committees were soon organized from the large number present, which went at once to work to frame a practical program. The celebration will begin next December—probably on Christmas Eve—the centennial of the signing of the Treaty of Ghent. Since the Treaty of Ghent marks the beginning of permanent peace between England and the United States, the peace demonstrations, lasting through several months, promise to be the most noteworthy of recent years. It is not planned to make the demonstrations exclusively Anglo-Saxon, but to enlist all nations in the participation in a great international peace festival. The National capital, State capitals, other leading cities, every remote hamlet, will be given an opportunity to celebrate in their own way. It is interesting to note that England and Canada are making preparations on even a larger scale than we have yet undertaken.

The year 1915 is also the centenary of the beginning of the peace movement, a fact of far more significance than that of one hundred years of peace between Anglo-Saxon peoples; for it was out of the homes of David Low Dodge and Noah Worcester, in 1815, that came the forces which have given to our generation its stirring and hopeful faith in the ultimate abolition of war. This event will be appropriately celebrated. Besides, it is still hoped that the Third Hague Conference may meet next year. Then, too, there is the Panama Exposition, which will certainly be held, with the probability of a national and an international peace congress thrown in. Pacifists may expect a veritable renaissance of peace interests and activities in 1915.

The Canadian Society of New York.

On December 11, at the annual dinner of the Canadian Society of New York, Secretary Bryan spoke on "The Land We Live In." He laid special emphasis on the reasons why this country and Canada should desire peace with all nations, and said that, because of the vast numbers who come to our shores from all parts of Europe, "when we extend our hand in friendship we extend it to people everywhere. I believe we are making progress, and, while it is not likely that those now living can hope to see the day when there will be no war, I believe in the future there will be such a day." William T. White, finance minister of Canada, declared that today there is mutual understanding, respect, and regard between the United States and Great Britain. The hundred years of peace to be celebrated next year "will usher in a thousand years more," he said—"a millennium between the two great English-speaking nations of the world."

There is every reason to believe that such a period of Anglo-American peace may become also a millennium of peace between all the nations of the world.

Mr. Taft and the Monroe Doctrine.

Ex-President Taft addressed a large audience in New York, under the auspices of the New York Peace Society, on the evening of December 11. Mr. Taft contended that the Monroe Doctrine is a national asset of the highest value, especially for those who would promote the peace of the world. He expressed the opinion that the influence of this country in support of that doctrine had best be exercised alone. He pointed out that we have not exploited Porto Rico or the Philippines, that we had Cuba twice in our hands but did not keep it, and that yet the South American nations believe we intend territorial extension. The Monroe Doctrine has made peace for ninety years, said Mr. Taft, and why not for one hundred years more? The speaker believed that custom-houses in South America are at the bases of the various revolutions. Referring to Mexico, he agreed that the condition in Mexico is bad enough, but that European intervention would have made it far worse. Two other points made by the ex-President were that we who are not of the Government should uphold the hands of the President and the Secretary of State, present to the world a solid front with the prayer that the "policy" pursued may bring peace; also that we cannot be too careful to avoid forcing our own ideas of government upon people who, though favoring popular government, have such a different idea as to what constitutes it. Mr. Taft views the problems of Pan-America from the angle of wide and practical experience. His utterances upon any phase of those problems are received, therefore, with interest and attention.

Among the Peace Organizations.

The American Association for International Conciliation, in its quarterly report issued in December, 1913, gives the interesting information that Argentina, Brazil, and Peru have all organized branches of the association. The secretary for Argentina is Dr. Benjamin Aracia Victoria, with office at the American Legation, Buenos Aires; for Brazil, Mr. Helio Lobo, care Foreign Office, Rio de Janeiro; for Peru, Dr. Juan Bantista de Lavalle, San Pedro, 88, Lima. The association has done especially good service during the past three months in its publication and distribution of such documents as Lord Haldane's "Higher Nationality," President Eliot's "Japanese Characteristics," and Prof. George M. Stratton's "The Control of the Fighting Impulse."

The Honorable Robert Bacon, former Secretary of State and Ambassador to France, has returned from his tour through Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, and Peru. Mr. Bacon's tour was conducted as the representative of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He feels profoundly impressed by the general friendliness of the South American Republics for the United States. As a result of his visit, a number of new National Societies of International Law, of Associations of International Conciliation, and a number of exchange visits of representative men between the United States and South America will undoubtedly follow. But, more important, the spirit of international friendliness will be a finer thing because of Mr. Bacon's presence in the important nations to our south.

The Fourth National Conference of the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes was held in Washington, D. C., at the Shoreham Hotel, December 4-6, 1913. Among the questions discussed were: "Possibilities of Judicial Settlement as Shown by Practice of Nations," "The Need and Advantages of an International Court of Justice," "The Monroe Doctrine and the International Court." Distinctions between "Direct Diplomatic Settlement, Good Offices and Mediation, Friendly Composition, Commissions of Inquiry and Arbitration" were instructively drawn. Charles W. Eliot was elected president for the coming year; Dr. James Brown Scott, secretary.

The report of the Department of Peace and Arbitration of the World's Women's Christian Temperance Union for 1913 has just been issued by the superintendent, Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey. This department was organized in 1891, and a large amount of educational work has been accomplished, chiefly through the untiring activity of Mrs. Bailey. Fourteen different countries now have organized W. C. T. U. Peace Departments. The reports of the work in the South American countries, in Australasia and India, are especially interesting. Mrs. Frances S. Hallows, the superintendent for India, and author of "The Patriotism of Denys Mahon," writes: "I am 'instant in season and out of season' in circulating peace and arbitration ideas, and sending books and pamphlets in a wide sphere." The women in Australia are active in their opposition to the Defence Act, protesting with vigor "against the crushing of conscience under the iron heel of militarism." The aim of the World's Department is to secure a Peace Department in every civilized nation.